FOREWORD

This report is the result of work done by community and county land use planning committees of Lafayette county. The Agricultural Committee of the county board of supervisors, who plan the extension program for the county, voted to include land use planning as part of the program of work this year. They felt that the judgment and recommendations of over one hundred farm men and women and other county folks would be valuable help in formulating the program of work in the future. They thought this would result in the coordination of the work of the action agencies of the county on a unified program based on farmer opinion.

The assistant agent, V. W. Peroutky, who has given us invaluable help, was employed by the U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics through Agricultural Extension to work with the county agricultural agent in helping him with regular duties for the extra time he devotes to the land use program, to obtain basic information for use at planning meetings, and to help in preparing the final report.

County representatives of state and federal agencies cooperated with the Agricultural Committee on this project and they acted on the county land use committee. We appreciate the assistance in the organization and direction of this work given by B. F. Rusy and W. A. Rowlands, Supervisors of Agricultural Extension, and L. G. Sorden, State Representative of the U. S. Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

W.H. Eyers
Chairman, County Planning Committee

Leroy Reese
Secretary, County Planning Committee
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The land use planning program was requested and is sponsored by the Lafayette County Agricultural Committee. This committee first met jointly with the Green County Agricultural Committee in July, 1940. At this meeting, the land use project was explained to the committees by state representatives. The project was adopted and organization work relative to the accumulation of statistical data was started the latter part of July, 1940. In December, 1940, the Agricultural Committee divided the county into nine districts, believing this plan would facilitate the organization and procedure. The districts outlined in Figure 1 were formulated on the basis of central meeting places, soil classes and topography.

Figure 1 - Land Use Districts

The Agricultural Committee next named the county land use committee which is composed of farmers, farm women and county representatives of educational, state and federal agencies. In a few cases, state and federal agencies, upon request, named their own representatives to act on this committee. To make the selection of this committee most democratic, it was voted by the Agricultural Committee that they recommend the chairman of each township to act as temporary co-chairman for his township and that he be empowered to name or designate at
least two others besides himself, with one or more women, to act for the township. Township committees selected by the town chairmen at their first joint meetings within their districts elected their district chairmen who are automatically members of the county land use committee, and each district chairman is the one representative on this committee from his district.

The personnel of the county committee is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and Address</th>
<th>Representing</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.H. Ayers, Chr., Gratiot</td>
<td>Agr'l. Committee</td>
<td>Funeral Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will Curry, Darlington</td>
<td>Agr'l. Committee</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesley Mullen, Shullsburg</td>
<td>Agr'l. Committee</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn A. Cullen, Darlington</td>
<td>Agr'l. Committee</td>
<td>Supt. Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles B. Dugdale, Platteville</td>
<td>Agr'l. Committee</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.E. Phillipson, Blanchardville</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.W. McDonald, Darlington</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.H. Kettler, Platteville</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Bryant, Benton</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Thomas, Darlington</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grover McConnell, Darlington</td>
<td>Cheese Makers</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adolph Roelli, Shullsburg</td>
<td>Co. AAA Committee</td>
<td>Cheese Maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John R. Chapman, South Wayne</td>
<td>Soil Conservation Service</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dick Stauffacher, Baraboo</td>
<td></td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Stemmler, Darlington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farm Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ida Bakke, Dodgeville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farm Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrie Curry, Darlington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Public Welfare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ormond Benedict, Darlington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Service Clubs and Co-ops.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Ostrum, Blanchardville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bank3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell Hinkins, Belmont</td>
<td></td>
<td>Farm Organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. G.M. Gunderson, Argyle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conservation Clubs Minister and Rural Churches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuben James, Darlington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational Agricul-Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irene Narloch, Darlington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Cleary, Blanchardville</td>
<td></td>
<td>County Health Dept.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John H. Burke, Darlington</td>
<td></td>
<td>County Nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Russell Curry, Darlington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy N. Carter, Madison</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cheese Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.A. Whalen, Mineral Point</td>
<td></td>
<td>4-H Club Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.S. Daley, Dodgeville</td>
<td></td>
<td>Forestry Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy Reese, Sec'y, Darlington</td>
<td></td>
<td>Extension Forester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Federal Farm Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Production Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Ext. Co. Agr'l. Agric.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following district committeemen were selected:

District I
Argyle Twp.
A.O. Gunderson, Blanchardville
Roy Simpson, Sec'y., Argyle
Mrs. A.O. Gunderson, Blanchardville
Frank Nall, Argyle
Wm. Buckingham, Blanchardville
Laura Nelson, Argyle

District II
Lamont Twp.
Will Curry, Chr., Darlington
Mrs. Vivian Barnes, Sec'y., Darlington
Vivian Barnes, Darlington

District III
Kendall Twp.
P.W. McDonald, Chr., Darlington
Mrs. Francis Fitzsimons, Sec'y., Darlington
S.P. Byrne, Belmont
Joe Palzkill, Mineral Point
John Bradley, Belmont

District IV
Belmont Twp.
Charles Dugdale, Platteville
Mrs. Graydon Todd, Sec'y., Belmont
Walter Steinhoff, Belmont
Will Martin, Belmont
Arnold Bluemke, Belmont

District V
Benton Twp.
Clinton Bryant, Chr., Benton
Mrs. Walter Calvert, Sec'y., Benton
Walter Calvert, Benton
A. Sampson, Benton
Fred Temple, Benton
Leo Laird, Cuba City

Blanchard Twp.
O.E. Phillipson, Chr., Blanchardville
James Mohr, Sec'y., Blanchardville
Jacob Syftestad, Blanchardville
Mrs. Ben Strommen, Blanchardville
Elmer Hanson, Blanchardville

Fayette Twp.
Guy VanMatre, Mineral Point
Mrs. Matt Helm, Sec'y., Darlington
Ralph Vinger, Argyle
Geo. Bredeson, Darlington
Henry Karlen, Darlington

Willow Springs Twp.
Edwin Stauffacher, Calamine
Mrs. Merle Chambers, Sec'y., Darlington
Merle Chambers, Darlington
Wm. McCarville, Darlington
Paul Ruf, Darlington
Henry Switzer, Mineral Point

Elk Grove Twp.
O.H. Kettler, Chr., Platteville
Mrs. Geo. Todd, Sec'y., Belmont
Geo. Todd, Belmont
Martin Adickes, Belmont

New Diggings Twp.
Chester Peacock, Cuba City
Mrs. James Ayer, Sec'y., Cuba City
James Ayer, Cuba City
John Robbins, New Diggings
District VI

Seymour Twp.
Frank Gough, Darlington
Mrs. Emil Pehrson, Sec'y., Shullsburg
Emil Pehrson, Shullsburg
Ed Klot, Darlington
Russell Hinkins, Belmont

Darlington Twp.
Walter Thorns, Chr., Darlington
Mrs. Arthur Peterson, Sec'y., Dar-
Homer Kil Kelly, Darlington
Nathan Benedict, Darlington
Reuben James, Darlington

District VII

Wiota Twp. (Unl)
Grover McConnell, Chr., Dar-
Chas. Hicks, Darlington
lington
Dennis McConnell, Darlington
Mrs. Geo. Engebretson, Sec'y.,
Albert Johnson, South Wayne
South Wayne
Geo. Atter, Argyle

Geo. Engebretson, South Wayne
Mrs. Clara Monson, South Wayne

District VIII

Gratiot Twp.
Adolph Roelli, Chr., Shulls-
burg
Mrs. John Doyle, Sec'y.,
Gratiot
Chas. McGinnis, Darlington
Alvin Russell, Apple River, Ill.

District IX

Shullsburg Twp.
Wesley Mullen, Chr., Shulls-
burg
Mrs. R.D. Teasdale, Sec'y.,
Shullsburg
R.D. Teasdale, Shullsburg
Will Fitzgerald, Shullsburg
J.F. Baker, Shullsburg
John Stanton, Shullsburg

Monticello Twp.
Vernon Scott, Apple River, Ill.
Mrs. August Stiefel, Sec'y., Apple
River, Ill.
August Stiefel, Apple River, Ill.
Mrs. Arthur Youle, Shullsburg
Arthur Youle, Shullsburg

White Oak Springs Twp.
C.R. McCoy, Shullsburg
Alfred Heller, Sec'y., Shullsburg
Lorenzo Andrews, Shullsburg
Harry Magee, Scales Mound, Ill.

PROCEDURE

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Prior to the time of the first county committee meeting and the district meetings, the agricultural agent, with the assistant, accumulated background statistics which would be a definite factor in realizing the major problems and in recom-
mending solutions. It was through the splendid cooperation of
the following agencies that this information was made available: County A.A.A. Association, Soil Conservation Service, Farm Security, Federal Farm Loan Association, Production Credit Corporation, Public Welfare, Rural Electrification Administration, members of the county board of supervisors and others. Without their assistance and suggested recommendations, this program would have been impossible.

The following information was prepared and used:

1. A large Wisconsin map showing the counties in which the land use program had been adopted.

2. A large Wisconsin map showing soil conservation districts.

3. A large county map showing the land use districts as set up by the county Agricultural Committee.

4. Soil profiles obtained in three foot steel trays showing the soil layers from eroded and non-eroded areas.

5. Large charts pertaining to farm management with figures providing the following management factors:
   a. Effect of number of crop acres on labor income
   b. Effect of butterfat sales per cow on labor income
   c. Effect of value of crops on labor income
   d. Effect of feeding efficiency on labor income
   e. Effect of diversity on labor income
   f. The effect of having several factors above average on labor income

6. Other charts showed relationship of farm size to crop acres per man; analysis of investments in Wisconsin agriculture; labor income compared to farm land, farm homes, machinery and other property.

7. An information folder containing the following charts:
   a. Soil classification by townships
   b. Soil test requirement per acre by townships
   c. Soil erosion data based on Soil Conservation Service maps of 22 farms
   d. Soil erosion survey - a two mile survey in New Diggins township and a like survey in Monticello township.
   e. Percent slope on 22 Soil Conservation Service farms
   f. Land use suggestive rotation and suggestive practices computed on a study of 22 Soil Conservation Service farms
   g. Sources of gross farm income - Lafayette county.
   h. Lafayette county grain and hay acreages
   i. Individual graphs for each township including trends in all major crops and livestock
j. County livestock trends  
k. Total cheese and creamery butter production  
l. Yearly rainfall recorded at Darlington  
m. Average monthly precipitation  
n. Butterfat production of Lafayette county dairy cows  
o. Production, feed cost and investment over feed cost in producing milk  
p. Lafayette county tenancy study on a township basis showing the number of farms, number of tenants, percent of tenants, number related to landlord, percent related, number directly related, percent directly related, approximate number of movers in 1939, number paying cash rent, percent paying cash rent, number renting on 50-50 share, percent renting on 50-50 share, number renting on 40-60 share, percent renting on 40-60 share, number renting on other share, and percent renting on other share.  
q. Charts of information on township basis showing farm population; area (in acres); rating; number of farms; average acreage per farm; crop acreage per farm; permanent pasture and woods per farm; percent of farm in cropland; permanent pasture and woods and cropland in hay (%); value per acre; total cropland in A.A.A.; soil conserving cropland; tons of lime spread; pounds of phosphate and potash spread; A.A.A. payments and percentage of farms participating.

FIRST COUNTY COMMITTEE MEETING

The first meeting of the Lafayette county land use committee was held in the county board room of the Court House on December 13, 1940. Town chairmen, representatives of action agencies, and other county committeemen attended this meeting. The meeting was called to order by Chairman W. H. Ayers. County Agent Leroy Reese told of the action taken thus far by the Agricultural Committee pertaining to land use. Assistant Agent V. W. Peroutky briefly told what background information had been collected thus far. B. F. Rusy explained how district committees will function and how district chairmen to act on the future county committee would be selected. L. C. Sorden told what land use planning is and how it has functioned in other Wisconsin counties. A discussion followed, led by Chairman W. H. Ayers, and by M. P. Andersen, Rural Sociologist of the College of Agriculture. A suggestion was made to the town chairmen that in naming their committees they keep in mind those who are familiar with problems of the town and those who may have been or are now acting on a A.A.A. committee who are assessors, or the like. At the close of this meeting, the county agent arranged a schedule of meetings with the town chairmen, indicating the date and place of the first district meetings. District meetings were arranged, beginning on January 6, 1941. It was mutually agreed that the town chairmen send to the county extension office, not later than December 21.
1940, the list of names with addresses of those who had been selected to act on the township committees. In turn, the county agent's office sent notices of the place and date of the first district meeting to each committeeman within the respective districts.

FIRST SERIES OF DISTRICT MEETINGS

These district meetings were held in town halls in either afternoon or evening sessions, and most of them during the week of January 6. Where table space was available, the group seated themselves around the table; and in every case, in a circle or semi-circle so that discussion was encouraged. The county agent and assistant explained briefly the object of the program and what had already been done. The committee then elected their chairman and discussed briefly problems which they felt needed study and which required recommendations to improve the agriculture of their district, the county, the state and the nation. The assistant agent recorded the minutes of the meetings; but each town chairman appointed a secretary, a woman on his committee, to record recommendations during the next meeting. The next work was that of classifying the land according to the described areas. Committeemen used the pencils themselves in coloring in the land areas. Each township group of the district committee then made arrangements for their next meeting. These township meetings were held in homes, at school houses, and at town halls. The date was usually within one week of this first district meeting. Each committeeman was then presented with an information folder which had been prepared by the agents. After briefly discussing the folders' contents, it was suggested to the committeemen that they use these at their township meetings for information on some of their problems. The Lafayette County Statistical Bulletin, Number 202, was included in the folder. The date for their next and final district meeting was set by the entire committee before adjournment.

THE TOWNSHIP MEETINGS

Proof of the results of these township meetings is in the written minutes made by their appointed secretaries. It is apparent that the committees felt free to discuss and recommend, for their recommendations were usually neatly written with ink. The basis of practically all the recommendations came from secretaries' reports of their township meetings conducted, usually, in a member's home. The agents were not present at any meeting of this series. No Notices were sent for these meetings. Often lunch was served, and an informal type of meeting was held.
SECOND AND FINAL SERIES OF DISTRICT MEETINGS

A letter was sent to each committeeman, reminding him of the place and date of this final district meeting as set up by his own committee. These meetings were usually held in the same place as the first district meeting; all meetings were again attended by the agent and the assistant. The following procedure, with slight variations, was used: discussion of questions relative to the planning program; final approval of land use and erosion areas as outlined by the committee. (All town maps were stapled on a large cardboard so that a picture of the entire county could be seen.) Recommendations were recorded by the assistant for the best farming practices on each outlined area; problems which had been brought up in the first district meeting were reviewed; a report of the township meeting was given by the township committee secretary; a discussion followed, and recommendations which were approved by the entire district committee were recorded; the agents explained what course would be taken with the land use map and their recommendations.

THE SECOND COUNTY COMMITTEE MEETING

After all the recommendations made by district committees were classified, the county committee again met in the Court House at 10:00 A. M. on Friday, March 28. W. H. Ayers, Chairman, called the group to order. The object of the meeting, as explained by Mr. Ayers, was to act on the recommendations as read by the secretary, Leroy Reese. The recommendations were to be approved, additions were to be made prior to approval, or the recommendation was to be rejected. During the forenoon, the land use classification map, with the land use and erosion control recommendations, were discussed and finally approved. At noon, the entire group adjourned to the hotel's private dining room where the meeting continued after the meal. Considerable interest was manifested, as the meeting did not adjourn until 5:45 P. M. W. A. Rowlands, B. F. Rusy, and L. A. Salter of the Agricultural Economics Department of the College of Agriculture, made suggestive comments at this meeting, based on their experiences in other counties of the state.

FINAL RECOMMENDATIONS FORMULATED

Following this second county land use committee meeting, the final recommendations were grouped according to the major problems evident in the county. The Agricultural Committee believed it would be advisable to have a third county committee meeting prior to the publication of the report. Because of the busy spring season of farm work, it was decided that this would not be feasible at present, but that a typed copy of the final recommendations classified by problems would be sent to each member of the county committee. An enclosed letter explained that each member had the privilege to make any additions or corrections and that he would be granted one week for such a reply.
After this one week approving period, the recommendations were added to the body of the final Lafayette County Land Use Report. On about June 1, 1941, the report was completed and ready to be approved by the state land use committee. The report is to be presented to this state committee, with seven other county land use reports, probably during the month of June, 1941.

LOCATION

Lafayette County, Wisconsin, is located in the southwestern part of the state on the Illinois boundary. The western border of the county is only ten miles from the Mississippi River, while the eastern boundary is almost one hundred miles from Lake Michigan. Darlington, the county seat, is about forty-five airline miles southwest of Madison. Three Wisconsin counties form the borders within the state -- Iowa county on the north, Green on the east, and Grant on the west. Jo Daviess and Stephenson, two Illinois counties, form the southern boundary. (Refer to cover page.)

HISTORY

There is evidence that the Winnebago, most primitive of the Indian tribes in Wisconsin, had been in southwestern Wisconsin for a long time. Mounds built, it is believed, by their ancestors are common throughout this region. Bands of this tribe were mining lead in a very crude manner when the first American miners came into this lead country in 1823-24. Traders operating on the Mississippi and Wisconsin rivers continued to barter for lead and furs after the withdrawal of the Indians. Mining was the primary motive which brought the first white people into Lafayette county; men with money and also adventurous laborers seeking work and all gambling on the possibility of sudden wealth. Many of them had been members of the American's military force sent to Prairie du Chien in 1816. The newcomers were largely from the upper south. A few even brought slaves which were freed after a few years.

The early lead miners are credited as establishing the nicknames of the two states, Wisconsin and Illinois. The miners who came into Wisconsin during the summer from Galena and other Illinois settlements and returned to Illinois in the winter were called "Suckers" after the fish by that name which migrate up and down streams with the seasons. Those who remained in Wisconsin during the winter often lived in cave-like homes cut into the sides of the hills whereupon
they were called "Badgers".

Besides the native born of Kentucky, Missouri and nearby states, the population was soon increased by miners from Europe -- Irish, Welsh, and English. Among the earliest comers was Jesse Shull after whom Shullsburg is named. Noted settlers of Lafayette county were Governors Nelson and Washburn, and Dunn, the first Chief Justice of Wisconsin.

As returns from mining began to decrease some of the miners entered land claims and began farming.

This region was one of the first parts of Wisconsin to be surveyed into townships and sections (Survey of 1832). It was organized into a county in 1846. A United States land office was opened at Mineral Point in 1834, and this gave prospective settlers easy access to information on where to look for farm land. Until the Wisconsin territorial boundary was finally established to include both the Green Bay and Lake Michigan waterfronts, Lafayette county was relatively the center of the white population and the first territorial capitol was located at Belmont.

Four years after the county was established, there were 11,531 inhabitants, according to the United States Census. The peak of population was reached in 1870 when the census reported 22,659 persons, while in 1880 it had declined to 21,279. The following Figure 2 shows the population trends, Lafayette county was tied for forty-third in total population per square mile in 1930 with 29.0 persons, which is considerably below the state average of 53.2 persons.

Figure 2 - Population of Lafayette County, 1850-1940

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1850</td>
<td>11,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>18,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>22,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>21,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>20,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>20,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>20,075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>20,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>18,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>18,695</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(According to the Census, all of the population in each year was classed as rural since there were no cities of 2,500 or more persons in the county.)

AREA

With a total land area of 401,339 acres, Lafayette county has about 1.14 percent of the total area of the state. The
county is forty-seventh among the 71 counties of the state, being slightly smaller than Waushara county and about 20,000 acres larger than Manitowoc, which ranks forty-eighth. Lafayette county is smaller than either Grant or Iowa of the adjoining counties, but is larger than Green county.

The eighteen civil towns in the county vary greatly in size. Gratiot is the largest town with 33,626 acres followed by Wiotla, 33,523 acres, and Willow Springs with 30,582 acres. White Oak Springs has only 10,570 acres which is less than half a government township. Blanchard is the second smallest town with 11,508 acres.

TOPOGRAPHY

With the exception of a small portion of the southeastern corner, Lafayette county lies entirely within the great Driftless Area of Wisconsin, Illinois, Minnesota, and Iowa. Rolling topography is typical throughout. There are considerable areas of rough, hilly land and several level areas, but rolling or undulating land is characteristic of the greater part of the county. The region of which Lafayette county is a part is a dissected upland or plateau formed upon Galena-Black River limestone and sloping rather gently to the south. Upon this plateau are located several mounds or hills which are remnants of much higher formations now eroded away. The surface features of the Driftless Area are those produced primarily by stream erosion. The areas between the creeks and rivers are usually broad and rolling. Stream valleys are cut rather deeply into the upland, often as much as 200 to 300 feet below the general level, but are very narrow compared with the interstream areas. Rock outcrops often separate the uplands from the valley bottoms especially in the tributary valleys where they form perpendicular rock walls just at the base of the upland.

The glaciated southeastern corner of the county closely resembles the Driftless Area. It lies within the region known as the "Old Drift" -- an area which was glaciated but not covered by ice during the last advance of the ice. The region contains none of the features usually considered characteristic of northern and eastern Wisconsin, which was glaciated by the Wisconsin ice sheet -- the last of the ice sheets. Lakes, swamps and moraines are absent. The slopes are somewhat more gentle and the valleys generally wider in the "Old Drift" region than in the Driftless Area.

Located on the aforementioned ridge in the central part of the town of Belmont are the Platte Mounds. These mounds, and the mound near White Oak in the southern part of Lafayette county, are capped with Niagara limestone which has been entirely removed by erosion elsewhere in the county. The local relief is not great -- the mounds varying from 180 to 300 feet above the surrounding country. The lower slopes of these
mounds developed on Richmond shale, a weak rock formation, are gentle, but the upper slopes are abrupt, even precipitous on Platte mound. They range from 1,200 to 1,400 feet above sea level.

SOILS

The soils of Lafayette county are largely residual, that is, derived from the weathering of the underlying bedrock or bedrock which has now been eroded away. There are also loessial, or windblown soils; and alluvial, or stream-transported soils; and colluvial or soils washed down from the hillsides. There has never been a detailed analysis of the soils in Lafayette county. The general soil map of Wisconsin indicates the three main classes within the county are Knox silt loam, prairie soils, and rough, hilly land.

According to estimates, the following townships have a large percentage of silt loam soils: Blanchard, Darlington, Fayette, Kendall, Monticello, Wayne and White Oak Springs. The following townships have a large percent of prairie soils: Belmont, Gratiot, Lamont, Seymour and Shullsburg. The following townships have a large percent of rough land: Argyle, Blanchard and New Diggings.

CLIMATE

Rainfall records have been kept by the U. S. Weather Reporting Service stationed at Darlington. The average yearly rainfall is 31.3 inches. (Figure 3).

Figure 3 - Yearly Precipitation, 1910-40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inches</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yrs.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ten inches of snow is equivalent to one inch of rain.

There is little correlation between yearly rainfall and crop yields because in years of excessive rainfall, usually
one or two heavy rains arrive too early or late to be of benefit to crops. The average monthly precipitation is shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4 - Average Monthly Precipitation

Lafayette county has an average growing period of 140-150 days. Over a twelve year period, the last killing frost has been between May 10-20; and the first killing frost, between September 15-20. Hybrid corn of 115 or 120 days is generally recommended.

FARM INCOME

The county is a transition zone between an intensive dairy area and the corn-belt type of agriculture. In the eastern section, dairying predominates, with the emphasis on the production of foreign cheese. Here the cheese factory located at the crossroad is a common sight. The large barn and adjoining silo are characteristic of most of the farms. While cheese factories exist in the western part of the county, they are by no means as numerous. Feed lots, feed racks, and corn cribs are common features of many of the farms in this part of the county. Black and white Holsteins occupy most of the pastures; but blochy, heavy beef cattle being fattened for market are often seen. The western part of Lafayette county and the eastern part of Grant is perhaps the most intensive hog producing area in the state.

Slightly over 50 percent of the farm land in Lafayette county is devoted to the production of crops. Feed crops account for the largest share of the acreage. Corn was most important from the standpoint of acreage in 1940, followed by oats, clover and timothy hay, and alfalfa hay. (Figure 5). Average acreages for the period 1917 to 1940 indicate the same -- corn, oats, clover and timothy, and alfalfa in order. In the years 1930-1938, approximately 67 percent of the corn grown in the county was utilized for grain which is very different than the averages from the state as a whole. Silage,
the chief manner in which the corn crop of the state is utilized, was only 21 percent of the total in Lafayette county. Other uses of corn including hogged off, fed green, and fodder accounted for the remainder. There have been at least 1,000 silos in the county since 1921.

Figure 5 - Major Crop Acreages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thousand Acres</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1925</th>
<th>1930</th>
<th>1935</th>
<th>1940</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Corn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Oats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Clover &amp; Timothy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Alfalfa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Barley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Records showing milk shipped from the county to points outside the state indicate that shipments vary much from year to year with no shipments reported by dairy plants in a number of the years. Shipments of cream have varied less than milk with some reported for every year since 1927.

Many more pounds of cheese than that of any other dairy product have been made in Lafayette county dairy plants since 1905. In 1885 and 1895, more butter than cheese was reported. Compared with other counties in 1938, Lafayette ranked second in the production of Swiss cheese, sixth in limburger, seventeenth in brick and Munster, thirty-first in American cheese, and sixteenth in total cheese. (Figure 6). The county ranks seventh in the number of cheese factories licensed as of May, 1938, having 87 factories listed at that time. There were 4 creameries and 16 receiving stations.
The county ranked third in total hog numbers on January 1, with only Dane and Grant counties having a larger number in 1939. Livestock numbers at the beginning of 1939 were generally smaller than the record or near-record numbers in 1932 and 1933. From 1933 to 1935, hog numbers dropped sharply but recently they have increased to almost equal the record in 1933. Cattle numbers were highest on record at the beginning of 1919, but dropped to the lowest point in 1928. From 1928 to 1933, there was a considerable increase in the number of cattle in Lafayette county, declining to less than 60,000 in 1935. Since 1935, there has been a slight upward trend. (Figure 7).

On January 1, 1939, there were more swine than cattle on Lafayette county farms, and the county led in the state in the number of hogs for each 100 acres of land in farms.

The importance of agriculture to Lafayette county is apparent in the gross farm income. It was estimated at $6,187,573 in 1936 which was more than twice the value of all products manufactured in the county in 1937, and almost twice as much as the total in 1935.

Lafayette ranked second to Green in percentage of income derived from livestock.

Lafayette is almost equally divided between dairying and the corn-belt type of agriculture which is shown by the fact that milk accounted for 38.4 percent of the total and swine, for 37.4 percent.
The following tabulation shows the important sources of gross farm income in 1927 and 1936, compared with the state. (Figure 8).

Figure 8 - Farm Income - Lafayette County vs. State

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Lafayette County</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1927</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogs</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle and calves</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry and eggs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other items</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Township information grouped as to land use districts is set up in Figure 9. This data was obtained through the cooperation of the A.A.A. office, from assessors' reports and from Bulletin Number 202.
Figure 9 - General Information - Lafayette County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ar-</th>
<th>Blan-</th>
<th>La-</th>
<th>Fay-</th>
<th>Ken-</th>
<th>Willow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gyle</td>
<td>char</td>
<td>mont</td>
<td>ette</td>
<td>dall</td>
<td>Spr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm population</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (in acres)</td>
<td>23,018</td>
<td>11,508</td>
<td>12,765</td>
<td>22,848</td>
<td>26,979</td>
<td>30,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank in size</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farms</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. acreage per farm</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop acreage per farm</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent pasture and woods per farm</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farm in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent pasture and woods</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland in hay (%)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value per acre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dollars - 1935)</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.A.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cropland in A.A.A.</td>
<td>9,270</td>
<td>5,035</td>
<td>6,534</td>
<td>14,980</td>
<td>12,190</td>
<td>14,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil conserving cropland</td>
<td>5,710</td>
<td>3,275</td>
<td>3,629</td>
<td>9,104</td>
<td>7,616</td>
<td>9,104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tons lime spread</td>
<td>1,723</td>
<td>1,101</td>
<td>955</td>
<td>1,633</td>
<td>3,044</td>
<td>3,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pounds phosphate and potash spread</td>
<td>48,500</td>
<td>8,997</td>
<td>9,635</td>
<td>8,205</td>
<td>46,582</td>
<td>43,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farms participating</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Figure 9 (Cont'd.) - General Information-Lafayette County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IV Belmont</th>
<th>Elk Grove</th>
<th>V Benton</th>
<th>New Diga.</th>
<th>Seymourn</th>
<th>VI Darlington</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm population</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (in acres)</td>
<td>26,617</td>
<td>23,064</td>
<td>18,439</td>
<td>15,157</td>
<td>23,051</td>
<td>29,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank in size</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farms</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. acreage per farm</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop acreage per farm</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent pasture and woods per farm</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farm in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent pasture and woods</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland in hay (%)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value per acre (Dollars - 1935)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.A.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cropland in A.A.A.</td>
<td>14,478</td>
<td>13,103</td>
<td>7,564</td>
<td>5,394</td>
<td>16,834</td>
<td>15,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil conserving cropland</td>
<td>7,117</td>
<td>6,589</td>
<td>4,139</td>
<td>2,786</td>
<td>8,818</td>
<td>8,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tons lime spread</td>
<td>3,125</td>
<td>2,121</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>3,156</td>
<td>2,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pounds phosphate and potash spread</td>
<td>38,834</td>
<td>25,290</td>
<td>11,240</td>
<td>57,605</td>
<td>37,370</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farms participating</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 9 (Cont'd.) - General Information-Lafayette County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VII Wichita</th>
<th>VIII Grant</th>
<th>VIII Wayne</th>
<th>IX Shullsburg</th>
<th>X Monticello</th>
<th>White Oak Sp.</th>
<th>County Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farm population</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>244</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area (in acres)</td>
<td>33,623</td>
<td>23,816</td>
<td>22,962</td>
<td>22,940</td>
<td>12,401</td>
<td>10,570</td>
<td>401,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank in size</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of farms</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average acreage per farm</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop acreage per farm</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent pasture and woods per farm</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farm in:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent pasture and woods</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland in hay (%)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value per acre (Dollars-1935)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A.A.A.

<p>| | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total cropland in AAA</td>
<td>17,216</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>16,209</td>
<td>1,713</td>
<td>6,713</td>
<td>4,092</td>
<td>209,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil conserving cropland</td>
<td>9,901</td>
<td>12,843</td>
<td>9,218</td>
<td>5,982</td>
<td>3,409</td>
<td>2,037</td>
<td>117,004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tons line spread</td>
<td>1,614</td>
<td>4,689</td>
<td>2,368</td>
<td>2,314</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>39,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pounds phosphate and potash spread</td>
<td>63,225</td>
<td>50,861</td>
<td>51,142</td>
<td>17,394</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>610,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of farms participating</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The basis of land classification is its present land use. This may not be in accord with its natural adaptation, however. Many steep slopes would be better unplowed and some would be best left with its original cover, trees. According to land inventory, Lafayette county has 93% of its area cleared for agricultural purposes, 6% woodland, 0.17% marshland, and 0.85% for special uses. There being no lakes, very little of the surface is covered by water.

General types of agriculture are practiced throughout the county. There are areas, however, which specialize more in some enterprise. Elk Grove, Willow Springs and Kendall townships raise peas for canning; swine are more concentrated in Belmont township, with less dairying in that area; beef and swine are raised considerably in Belmont, Kendall and Elk Grove townships; Monticello raises more corn and small grain compared to livestock. Because of the lead mines in Benton, New Diggings and Shullsburg townships, farmers have devoted some of their time to mining. This has resulted in smaller farms in that area, and also it has resulted in lower total income per family.

**MAJOR PROBLEMS OF LAFAYETTE COUNTY**

It is recognized by the land use committee that Lafayette county has many agricultural problems. The Agricultural Committee, in the past, has attempted to include the major problems in the county agent’s program of work. This Committee, believes, however, that there are possible problems which, in the past, have not but should have been included. The committee lists these as the major agricultural problems, and their personal recommendations are classified on this basis:

1. As 81.3% of the land in Lafayette county is classified by the local committee as subject to soil erosion, the county committee definitely decided this to be the first major problem. Soil erosion control, then, is the big land use planning problem in this county.

2. Tenancy in this county is the highest in the state. It brings about problems in the establishment of soil erosion control practices, maintenance of soil fertility, farm credit and many others.

3. The butterfat produced per cow is not as high as it should be, and better quality products could be produced if better milk were brought to the milk plants.
4. Soil tests indicate that there is a soil fertility problem that must be considered if the present standard of production is to be maintained.

5. Canada thistles and field bindweed are a severe menace to the productivity of Lafayette county farms.

6. Farm buildings and machinery make up a large part of the investments of our farms. Up-keep and maintenance of these items are higher than some farms can afford.

7. Youth finds it difficult to establish themselves on farms.

8. There is a definite farm labor problem. Large numbers of young men from the farms are being drafted. Few people understand the relationship of the Public Welfare Department to the labor situation.

9. Farm woodlots in Lafayette county are small. More are needed.

10. There is need of a unified program for agriculture worked out each year with farm representation and the various agricultural agencies. This could be used as a guide for the Agricultural Committee in planning the extension program of work.

11. The schools, particularly rural schools and vocational agriculture departments, can cooperate in the carrying out of this agricultural program of the county.

12. The beautification of home, school and factory grounds needs encouragement.

13. Many folks of our rural areas do not make use of our excellent home-grown products to improve their health standards.

14. Some sections of the present Agricultural Conservation Program are not very applicable to the Lafayette county farmer.

15. General problems of the county require local recommendations for practicability.

LAND USE CLASSIFICATION

This land classification involves the classification of each designed land use area. An area in this program consists of not less than one farm nor less than 150-200 acres. The land use areas have been carefully outlined by the committeemen themselves.
The standard classifications as used in all counties is as follows:

A. **Areas Now In Farms Which Are Not Suited For Farming And Should Be Put To Some Other Use.**

B. **Areas Not Now In Farms And Which Should Not Be Used For Farming.**

C. **Areas Now In Farms And Which Are Questionably Suited For Farming.**

D. **Areas Not Now In Farms But Which Are Suitable For Development.**

E. **Areas Which Are Now In Farms And Which Should Remain In Farming.**

The Agricultural Committee decided that it was an advantage that the "E" area be sub-divided and that the division be based on erosion. There was no margin indicated on the land use map, Figure 10, between river bottom land, flat land and level high land; nor was any margin indicated between slope percentage, as one slope may contain various classifications and degrees of erosion.

The final land use classification as used in Lafayette county is as follows:

C. **Areas Now In Farms And Which Are Questionably Suited For Farming.** Two townships have small areas. Color red.

E. **Areas Which Are Now In Farms And Which Should Remain In Farming.** Color yellow.

**E₁** - Areas in which soil erosion is little or no problem. It may be either: (Light yellow).

(a) Flat land other than river bottom

(b) River and creek bottom land

**E₂** - Areas in which soil erosion is a problem and in which there is need for change in cropping practices if controlling practices have not already been put into effect. It may be classed as: (Dark yellow).

(a) Gentle slopes, slight to moderate erosion

(b) Medium slopes, moderate to severe erosion

(c) Steep slopes, too steep or shallow for safe cultivation or severely eroded
LAND USE AREAS AND SOIL EROSION CONTROL

Class C Land (Red)

This land area is questionably suited for farming because of unproductive, light or sandy soils that have been badly eroded in some cases. There are only two small areas of C land in the county, 1408 acres in Argyle township, 6.1% of the town, and 64 acres in Wiota township, .2% of the township area. (Figure 11). This equals a total acreage of 1472 acres in the county and only .4% of the total area, and is, therefore, not a serious condition. Various recommendations from committee members are as follows: (1) It is best suited for woodland; it should be thus protected from fire and grazing with selective cutting; (2) Sections or parts of such farms should be retired from cultivation and seeded to permanent pasture with
sweet clover, as recommended in pasture renovation; (3) if only a small area of the farm is in this class, better soil building practices should be used. Only crops best suited for the area should be planted.

Figure 11 - Summary Sheet of Land Use Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class E Land</th>
<th>E land sub-divided</th>
<th>Acre</th>
<th>Per-cent</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Per-cent</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Per-cent</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>% Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>21610</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>6528</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>15062</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>1408</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>25018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>26617</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9152</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>17465</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>18439</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1152</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>17287</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td>11508</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>9588</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>29992</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5952</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>24040</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>23065</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>9024</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>14041</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>22848</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2816</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20032</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratiot</td>
<td>33616</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>29720</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall</td>
<td>26979</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5954</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21025</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>12765</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12445</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>12401</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10927</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Diggins</td>
<td>16157</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2240</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13917</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td>23052</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>22156</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shullsburg</td>
<td>22941</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2560</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>20361</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>22962</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6336</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>16626</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Oak Spr.</td>
<td>10570</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9610</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Springs</td>
<td>30583</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4416</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>26168</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>30583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiota</td>
<td>33559</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>6514</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>27046</td>
<td>80.4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>33559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>399864</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>72308</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>327556</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>1472</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>401336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the total farm land, 327,556 acres, or 81.3%, is subject to soil erosion.

Class E Land (Yellow)

Evidence of Soil Erosion

Cultivation and pasturing have removed protective plant cover. Man, with the axe, the plow and his livestock, has destroyed a large portion of the natural plant cover that originally protected their landscape from the destruction by erosion. Erosion losses are increasing. Each year, cultivated crops remove or destroy a part of this plant or organic matter so abundantly present in the virgin soil. We have what is called a continental climate with heavy, hard rains, in contrast with the climate of northern Europe which is markedly influenced by their closeness to the sea. Changes in temperature are more gradual; and while the total rainfall may be even greater than ours, their storms are gentle, the rains come slowly, and there is almost no soil washing. There is a saying in western Wisconsin that one hard storm in a season
washes away more soil than all of the other rains of the year. Because of the erosion problem, one of Lafayette county's major problems, the land use committee divided Class E land on the basis of soil erosion.

Our erosion problem is evident from several sources. The College of Agriculture classifies soil erosion in Lafayette county as slight to moderate, with occasional gullies. The extreme northwestern and the northeastern corners of the county is subject to more serious gullyling. Several surveys pertaining to the seriousness of erosion have been made in the county.

The following tables are based on a summary of 22 Lafayette county farms which are under agreement of the Soil Conservation Service. Some of these farms are located in the eastern part of the county which were in the Argyle C.C.C. camp area, and other farms under Soil Conservation Service planning are in the Platteville C.C.C. camp area. Measurements of maps of these 22 farms were used to arrive at the data shown, and they report a total area of 3,319 acres, an average of 151 acres per farm. There are 1,419 acres in permanent pasture and woods, an average of 64 acres per farm (42% of the farm). The cultivated area represents 1,761 acres, an average of 80 acres per farm (53% of the farm). Figure 12 shows the percent of the "horizon" which is eroded on these 22 Lafayette county farms. The "A horizon" is a productive layer having more organic matter, being more granular, and being of a darker color.

Figure 12 - Soil Erosion: Percent of "A Horizon" Eroded**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Class</th>
<th>Total No. in Survey</th>
<th>A. Erosion</th>
<th>% Eroded</th>
<th>Recent Deposit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>25-50%</td>
<td>50-75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacial and loess (loam)</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual (heavy)</td>
<td>2465</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom land (Poorly drained)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gullies prevalent in some areas.

Soil profiles were obtained in three sections of the county. These profiles were secured in steel trays which were three feet long, six inches wide and one and one-half inches deep. They were obtained of Dubuque, Dodgeville and Tama soils, showing, in each case, the depth of the "A" and "B" soil layers in eroded and non-eroded fields. The "B" soil
layer is below "A" and is referred to as sub-soil which is rather clayey, compact, lighter in color than "A" (top soil), which contains little or no organic matter. These trays of soil profiles were taken to all the land use meetings of the series to show the actual soil layers.

To further emphasize the seriousness of erosion, two-mile surveys were taken in New Diggings and in Monticello townships. A soil auger was used to find the depth of the "A" and "B" soil layers in virgin soil compared to areas every few rods during the two miles. Summarizing these surveys, reference is made to Figures 13 and 14. Figure 13 shows the results of the survey in New Diggings township.

Figure 13 - Soil Erosion (2 mile survey in New Diggings township). Virgin soil 16" to B1

2% of land was level
2% " had 3% slope - 15" to B1
15% " " 4% slope - 14" to B1
5% " " 5% slope - 16" to B1
19% " " 6% slope - 11" to B1
16% " " 10% slope - 16" to B1 - 16" to B1 rock
9% " " 12% slope - 9" to B1 - 8" to 14" rock
1% " " 25% slope - 8" rock
31% " " rough - no tabulation

The following Figure 14 indicates the results of the survey in Monticello township. The greatest difference between this survey and the one made in New Diggings township is that bedrock was of a greater distance from the surface in the latter.

Figure 14 - Soil Erosion (2 mile survey in Monticello township). Virgin soil 12" dark soil, 24" to B1

2% of land had 2% slope; 12" dark soil, 21" to B1
8% " " 6% slope, 9-3/4" " 16" to B1
5% " " 7% slope 8" " 11" to B1
50% " " 9% slope 7" " 13" to B1
9% " " 10% slope 6-2/3" " 12½" to B1
6% " " 12% slope 12" " 16" to B1
11% " " waste or level land or roads

A planimeter was used to measure the area of various percentages of slopes drawn on maps by the Soil Conservation Service. Hand levels were used to determine the percentage of slope which was indicated on these maps. Summarizing the findings on 22 of these farm maps, we note that 75% of the land has a slope of 3% to 20%. Reference is made to erosion
control practices following in this report. (Figure 15).

Figure 15 – Percent Of Slope
(on 22 S.C.S. Farms)

16.3% of land had slope of 0-3%
27.6% of land had slope of 3-8%
28.6% of land had slope of 8-12%
21.3% of land had slope of 12-20%
8.2% of land had slope of 20-30%

The following Figure 16 summarizes the land use recommendations made by the Soil Conservation Service on these same 22 Lafayette county farms.

Figure 16 – Land Use Recommendations By Soil Conservation Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Land</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Suggested Rotation</th>
<th>Suggested Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>C-G-H</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Rotation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>C-G-H-H-H-H</td>
<td>Field strips or buffer strips, contour strips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Rotation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>C-G-H – 6 years</td>
<td>Field strips, buffer strips or contour strips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Rotation</td>
<td></td>
<td>hay or pasture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>Hay or pasture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Plowed only for reseeding and soil treatment. Controlled grazing, renovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Pasture</td>
<td></td>
<td>Strict management, renovate when practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Wood and wildlife</td>
<td></td>
<td>Protect from fire and grazing. Selective cutting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Committee's Recommendations For Controlling Soil Erosion

Local committees have outlined the area which is subject to erosion; this area comprises 81.3% of the county. They
believe erosion control practices are feasible and practical. The following areas have been outlined on the map, Figure 10.

\[ \text{STRI\_CROPPING} \]

The following are definitions and recommendations made by the committee:

E1 - Land in which soil erosion is little or no problem. The total acreage in the county in this classification is 72,308, or 18.2% of the county land. It is divided into:

(a) Flat land other than river bottom with a slope of 0-3% and is subject to slight erosion.

(b) Flat river bottom land.

(a) The committee generally recommends a short rotation, consisting of corn, grain and hay, or two years of corn. Alfalfa is occasionally advisable and it may be desirable to leave as a hay crop until the crop thins. Timothy should be added in alfalfa seed mixtures. Clover and timothy may be substituted for alfalfa. Strip cropping may be an advantage in large areas. On level land not subject to erosion a rotation which consists of one-third or more of sod crops is required to maintain fertility. It is evident that a soil low in fertility, badly eroded or just naturally unproductive, requires a longer rotation or higher percentage of sod crops to build up or maintain fertility. The plowing under of a good crop of clover or alfalfa may be more advantageous than if the crop is fed or sold for cash. A field with a good stand of hay or grass will lose very little soil or moisture.

(b) On the flat river bottom lands, the committee is of the general opinion that a short rotation would be desirable in this area, with corn as a major part of the rotation where the area is not frequented by floods. In areas subject to flooding, blue grass pasture is probably the best crop. If experience has proven pasture is best, it should be kept in pasture. Alfalfa is not recommended because of the difficulty in haying and likelihood of poor drainage in low land. Such areas as these should be used for crops classified as soil depleting by A.A.A. if not subject to flooding. Seeding should be done occasionally to choke out weeds. If the hay area is only a narrow strip, it should be left as pasture. Barley is recommended for the grain crop in a rotation; red clover, alsike, red top or timothy will be best as a hay crop. Reed's canary grass is suggested for trial if an area is flooded for quite a portion of the year.
Land in which soil erosion is a problem and in which there is need in change in cropping practices, if controlling practices have not already been put into effect. All land in this class is colored a darker shade of yellow, and this class is divided into the following sub-classes:

(a) Gentle slopes
(b) Medium slopes
(c) Steep slopes

The committee made the following recommendations:

(a) Gentle slopes of 3-8% having slight to moderate erosion. A medium rotation with corn one year, grain one year, and seeded to hay. The length of time the hay crop remains in this rotation depends on the type of hay crop and its length of life. The shorter the rotation, the greater stress must be made on soil erosion control practices.

Generally, field strips are recommended. In some cases, contour strips are preferred, especially with cultivated crops such as corn.

A strip cropping system consisting of strips of hay alternating with strips of corn or grain. The hay strips spread the water evenly, preventing it from concentrating and forming gullies. The hay catches the soil from the corn or grain strips above.

Contour strips or contour cultivation is recommended where practical and the washing is more serious. Contour cultivation is farming where all plowing and cultivating is on the level rather than up and down the hill. It is the general belief that this practice gives all the protection needed on gentle slopes. Contour strip cropping is a system recommended where 50 to 125 foot strips of hay alternate with equal width strips of corn or grain. This type of strip cropping is most frequently used because it provides more effective erosion control and easier field operation. Hill dropping of corn with contour rows is suggested in place of checking.

In areas of gentle slopes where contour stripping is not practical, especially in smaller fields, buffer strips are suggested. Buffer strip cropping is a type of strip cropping where strips of sod a rod or more wide are left every 75 feet to 125 feet down the slope. This strip should be left on the contour. Such buffer strips may be decidedly practical where the slopes are very irregular.

On a short rotation on a gentle slope, terracing may be done. This consists of extra large furrows that are
just a little off the level, on a contour. The water is caught in this furrow and is allowed to slowly run off to one end. Here a sod draw allows it to go safely down the hill. Terracing should not be done in shallow soils. We recommend to anyone wishing to have terracing done, that it be done only upon the advice of experienced assistance.

(b) The committee recommends that medium slope areas receive the same general practices as the gentle slopes, with hay crops encouraged to form a longer rotation. There is a greater need for contour strips, terracing and other erosion control practices.

(c) In most cases, it is generally recommended that steep slopes in cultivation be put into permanent pasture or hay. It should be plowed only for reseeding and soil treatment; and when areas are plowed, rye is suggested for broadcasting prior to last cultivation. Prominent dead furrows should never be allowed. Plowing around the hill on a contour is recommended. If cropland is limited and these slopes must be cropped, the suggestions listed under gentle slopes are to be considered.

Many farms in the county have some land that is better suited to the growing of trees than for any other purpose. Steep land having slopes over 30-35 percent, light soil with low fertility, unused irregular areas or wasteland, and badly eroded land are the most common cases. It is recommended that these areas be protected and planted to trees to provide some income and guard against erosion. Reference is made to recommendations in woodlot conservation.

General Recommendations For All Erosion Areas In General Or Extreme Conditions In Any Of The Above Classes

In connection with the establishment of a strip cropping or contour strip cropping system, it is advised that rearranging the fences so that they run on a contour may be a time saver. By so doing, odd corners and point rows can be done away with and the fence serves as a permanent marker for contour lines.

Pasture renovation is recommended in pasture areas. This practice is especially recommended on steeper slopes that should be left in permanent hay or pasture. In pasture renovation, the soil should first be tested to determine the lime and fertilizer requirements for the successful growth of legumes. The lime is applied and then the sod is cut up thoroughly with a disc or spring tooth. This should be done early in the spring, before oats seeding time. If a fertilizer drill is not available, the fertilizer can be spread separately or with the lime and worked into the soil in the preparation of the seed bed. The seeding mixture recommended should consist primarily of legumes; and for details relative for seeding mixtures, we suggest the advice of the county agricultural agent.
If there is a fairly good soil, the seeding may be made without a nurse crop. A light nurse crop will help to check weeds. The renovated portion should be fenced and livestock kept out that year unless a good growth prevails. If such is the case, it may be pastured from August 1 to September 15. It should be left from September 15 to October 15, so the young plants may store food.

Relative to gully and stream bank control, the farmer who wishes to keep his fields free from gullies must give first consideration to proper land use and conservation farming on areas that contribute run off to gullies. Along with the adoption of proper land use, it is necessary to heal the old erosion scars by the best and cheapest means available. Sod hump dams can be successfully used in healing small gullies with small drainage areas. Sod flumes may be successfully used to lower the water safely in gullies with heads less than ten feet and drainage areas less than twenty-five acres. In many cases, it may be advisable to construct a plank or earth diversion dike around the head of a small gully and slope the head and seed it. Gullies having large drainage areas or bank cutting on large streams will usually require permanent structures. A combination of brush and rock wing dams and willow plantings will usually control stream bank cutting. All such areas should be protected from grazing. Most farmers find it pays to leave sod of sufficient width to prevent gullying in all drainage ways. These grass water ways should be at least ten feet wide or wide enough for a hay crop to be harvested; this prevents weed growth and improves the sod. They should be left with an uneven edge to prevent side gullies.

Soil erosion control methods are good practices to be stressed by teachers of vocational agriculture in their teaching programs. Levels and tapes for laying out field strips and the like are available through the county agent's office. It was recommended that the agricultural extension service help individual teachers, upon request, with the use of this simple equipment, in order that agricultural teachers may instruct their students relative to the use of tapes and levels.

Reports have been made where culverts were installed under a highway, allowing silt, sand, gravel and rock to be washed on to the surface of rich alluvial soil in low lands. It is recommended that the highway department, town, county or state, take into consideration these conditions prior to such installation and road construction. We suggest that all parties concerned (farmers; town, county and state government representatives; highway officials; and the Soil Conservation Service) meet to discuss the best methods of procedure.

Lafayette County Soil Conservation District Recommended

The evidence of a soil erosion problem in Lafayette county has been based on the judgment of committeemen and statistical information. General land use recommendations have been out-
lined by us. The county committee on land use planning believes the county could be greatly benefited with the aid of experienced soil erosion agents who would be available if Lafayette county were a soil conservation district.

It is understood that there are nineteen districts in Wisconsin at present (May 1, 1941); that the local Agricultural Committee of the county board are the supervisors in each district; that farmers living within districts are given an opportunity to enter a cooperative agreement with the County Agricultural Committee, by which the farmer agrees to follow recommended erosion control practices on their land in return for planning assistance in establishing these practices. The farmers themselves make their own farm plans with the aid of erosion specialists, and farmers may execute these plans as they see fit.

In conclusion, we recommend to the county board of supervisors that Lafayette county be established as a soil conservation district through passage of a resolution by that body. (Note - The Lafayette county board of supervisors, at the May 7th session, 1941, passed the resolution as recommended by the land use committee, making Lafayette county the twenty-first county to become a soil conservation district within the state. Juneau county was twentieth, added since the last county committee land use meeting.)

FARM TENANCY

Tenancy is typical of the corn-belt type of agriculture such as is characteristic in Lafayette county. Lafayette county ranks first in farm tenancy in Wisconsin. As early as 1880, the tenancy was 18.3%; and this was doubled by 1920, and nearly tripled by 1941. The following Figure 17 shows the tenancy from 1880 to the present time.

Figure 17 - Tenancy Trend in Lafayette County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tenancy Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>30.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>43.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A tenancy survey was made by the county extension office, county A.A.A. office and land use committeemen. (Figure 18).

This survey shows 54% of all farms are operated by renters. White Oak Springs leads the townships with 76%; and Monticello, with 71%, runs a close second. According to this survey, Lamont, Benton and Belmont are also comparatively high.

Figure 18 - Tenancy Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Total No. Farms</th>
<th>No. of Tenants</th>
<th>% of Tenants</th>
<th>No. Related to landlord</th>
<th>% Related</th>
<th>No. of Direct Relation</th>
<th>&amp; of Tot. Movers, 1939</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33.72</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34.40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>32.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.84</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42.16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48.78</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRATIT</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39.68</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamont</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.84</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Diggings</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30.86</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skullsberg</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32.25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Oak Sp.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Spr.</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.71</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winona</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48.64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2,639</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is significant to note, however, that in spite of the county's 54% tenancy, 30.7% of all tenants are related. There are 27.2% that are directly related, such as father and son, father and son-in-law, mother and son, and the like. The number of annual movers estimated at 140 is not great.

About 37% of renters are on a cash rent basis, while about the same number are on a 50-50 basis. The remaining tenants are on a 40-60 or some other percentage basis.

Long term leases are available in offices of education and action agencies of the county, and the committee recommends that landlords and tenants make more use of flexible lease forms. Agencies working with farmers are likewise advised to more fully recommend the use of these forms.
Whereas the tenancy in Lafayette county is the highest in the state, the committee recommends that the extension office contact the Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture, in order to secure assistance in conducting needed research on this tenancy problem. (Note - As a result of the above recommendation, at the last meeting of the county land use planning committee, L. A. Salter explained to the committee that the College of Agriculture, in cooperation with the state land use planning committee, would assist Lafayette county in making a detailed study of the tenancy problem. There is no problem where tenancy is 30% including relationships, but tenancy of 40% to 50% is a serious situation. If the ownership of land is going to non-resident people, the problem may be more serious. The erosion problem will be more serious under those conditions today. The college has not studied the ownership side of this problem. The committee recommends that its chairman, with the county agent, name a sub-committee to assist in the organization and procedure for this research project. It was suggested that the mail address of rural routes be checked at the post offices of the county and also that the number of movers be checked with A.A.A. files.)

DAIRY IMPROVEMENT

Annual county butter and cheese production are indicated graphically in Figure 6. Milk cattle and heifer numbers are also shown graphically in Figure 7. The 1940 census shows that on 2,156 Lafayette county farms reporting, there were 38,238 cows and heifers two years old and over, on January 1, 1940. Of this number, 35,716 were kept mainly for milk production. There were 20,501,345 gallons of milk produced in 1939.

The dairy information presented in this report emphasizes the importance of this project. The quality milk program is endorsed by the committees and factories are encouraged to cooperate 100%. This program should be permanent. (Note - The quality milk program was voted in by farmers and factory operators in April, 1941.)

According to our best information, the average dairy cow in our county produces only 175 pounds of butterfat per year. (Figure 19).

Figure 19 - Butterfat Production of Lafayette County Dairy Cows

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average Cow of County</th>
<th>Average DHIA Cow</th>
<th>Increase of DHIA Cow Over Average Cow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milk</td>
<td>3.230</td>
<td>7.114</td>
<td>1,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Butterfat</td>
<td>175.7</td>
<td>256.5</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If butterfat is selling at one and one-half times the increased income by herd calling would be worth $18.45 on a profit of $18.95 per cow. (The average cost per cow to belong to a testing association is $1.25.) At this rate or increased profit, one cow would pay for a sixteen cow herd. In order that more herdsmen may efficiently cull their herds, thereby raising butterfat averages, the committee recommends the owner-sampler method of milk testing be introduced into this county. The committee believes this would give herd efficiency results at the lowest cost to the farmer. If owner-sampler method of milk testing develops in Lafayette county, whereby milk samples are collected and tested in a central laboratory, it is our recommendation that W.P.A. and N.Y.A. labor be used where ever possible and practical.

Disasterous experiences have resulted from the use of so-called stock yard bulls peddled by truckers, and others to farmers in some sections of the county. It is recommended to the Wisconsin Legislature that laws be enacted to require a license for those who practice peddling stock yard bulls; also that the present laws relative to Bang's disease and the transfer of animals (over six months of age) into other herds be strictly enforced.

SOIL FERTILITY

Lafayette county soils have produced heavily in the past 75 years; and if replacements of plant food are not made, high yields cannot be expected in the future. This fact is emphasized by a summarization of 2,170 soil samples tested in 1940. (Figure 20.) 74% of these samples require 2 ton or more of lime per acre, 91% require phosphate, and 64% require potash.

The average results of fifteen grain fertilizer plots installed on farms in 1940 are as follows: check plots yielded 49.7 bushels, 0-20-0 applications yielded 66.9 bushels, while 0-20-10 applications yielded 68.3 bushels. These results check well with the 2,000 soil tests which indicated that 94% need phosphate and 63% need potash.

Figure 20 - Lime and Fertilizer Requirements

*Tons per acre.
The committee recommends the continuation of the W.P.A.
soil testing and soil survey project. By May 1, 1941, 1,500
samples had been tested this year for acidity, for phosphate
and for potash. Farm surveys have been made on twenty-five
farms, wherein soil testers take samples and, in turn, prepare
colored maps of the farm showing detailed fertilizer require-
ments in all sections of each field.

Through the W.P.A. lime grinding program of 1940, 22,603
tons of limestone were crushed and distributed to 484 farms.
Thirty-two quarries were used and eight operators did the
crushing. The following Figure 21 indicates the trend since
1935.

Figure 21 - W.P.A. Limestone Crushed in Lafayette County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Farms</th>
<th>Tons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>34,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>22,778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>25,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>578</td>
<td>25,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>31,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*1940</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>22,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**1941</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Considerably more lime could have been crushed by W.P.A.
labor in 1940, had it not been for a shortage of W.P.A. funds
to finance labor for this project.

**The 1941 figures are estimates. Besides this amount,
over 3,000 tons of lime have been crushed and distributed to
farmers on the A.A.A. program, with about 5,000 tons remaining
to be crushed, delivered and spread.

WEEDS

Weed eradication is becoming a
major problem in Lafayette county,
especially field bindweed (creeping
tenny) and Canada thistle. A survey
made by town assessors, weed commis-
ioners and by A.A.A. committeemen lo-
cated nearly one hundred patches of
creeping tenny. (Figure 21.) Un-
doubtedly, there are many patches undiscovered or unknown by farm operators.
This committee recommends to the county board
of supervisors that they consider an appropriation for sodium
chlorate. This would be bought and furnished to farmers on a
percentage basis (50-50; or 40% paid by the county, 60% paid
by the farmer). Farmers interested would pay their share of
the chemical obtained. An efficient program would be on a
county-wide scale; and W.P.A., N.Y.A., C.C.C. or other govern-
ment assistance is to be used when possible for chemical appli-
cation. Fall applications of chemical to Canada thistle and
field bindweed are recommended as the best time for control.

Figure 22 - Location of Patches of Field Bindweed in Lafayette County

On town and county roadsides, where weeds are a public nuisance, it is recommended that W.P.A. labor be used for weed destruction. The town would be responsible for supplying a sodium chlorate sprayer when used on such public property.

It is the recommendation of this committee that township boards consider the weed control plan successfully operated in townships of other counties, whereby the town is divided into two or more districts. The town chairman sends a letter with an enclosed stamped card. When the card holder has destroyed all noxious weeds according to law, he gives this information on the card and mails it to the district chairman. If the card does not return within a limited time, the district commissioner will make a personal call and carry out his duties as per regulations of the state weed law.

In crop land where thistles are a problem, it is suggested that alfalfa be seeded as a smother crop. If there is difficulty in establishing a good stand, lime and fertilizer should be used. It is advisable to clip the nurse crop, too; as it prevents thistles from seeding and insures a good stand of alfalfa.
The county ranks low in the number of occupied houses per square mile, with an average of 4.2. The county ranks seventh in number of cheese factories licensed as of May, 1939, having 87 factories, 4 creameries and 16 receiving stations.

The comparative value of farm buildings to the total value of the farm (buildings and land) is shown in Figure 22.

**Figure 22 - Value of Farms Compared With Building Values**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value of Land And Buildings</th>
<th>Value of Buildings Alone</th>
<th>Building Value, % of Farm</th>
<th>Total Value per Farm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>$30,688,704</td>
<td>$4,746,130</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$12,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>55,033,588</td>
<td>8,196,242</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td>37,902,232</td>
<td>10,557,695</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>30,743,041</td>
<td>10,829,272</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>13,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>19,037,549</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>8,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>19,897,952</td>
<td>8,140,194</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8,701</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Darlington High School department of vocational agriculture, farm management class, made a survey of their farms relative to the estimated cost of their home farm buildings other than the house. Although the summarization of this survey shown in Figure 23 may not be a county average, a general idea can be pictured. The average size farm in this survey is 200 acres.

**Figure 23 - Average Yearly Building Costs (house not included)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation</td>
<td>$ 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxes</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$578</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In view of the fact that the farm buildings comprise the major investment on many farms, the committee realizes there are outstanding problems dealing with this factor.
Buildings are depreciating faster than repairs are made in many cases in this county, seemingly due to lack of finances. Farm buildings in poor condition should be: (1) completely renovated; (2) let go and used as long as they will stand; or (3) constantly improved by adding little repairs. The circumstances such as size of farm, local markets, crops raised, possibility of combining farms, and the possibility of changing the cropping system or the type of livestock raised will determine the solution of the problem by the individual operator.

Farm buildings in fair condition: (1) could be neglected for the time being; (2) could be maintained periodically; or (3) could have new additions made. Again, the solution depends considerably on local factions.

For farm operators with good buildings, to be most practical and economical, the committee seriously recommends constant up-to-date maintenance.

The committee's recommendation for the present is that farm owners and operators, regardless of the present condition of his farm buildings, prior to repairing or rebuilding, should first use their good judgment based on all of the factors listed above; we suggest that their good judgment be combined with the advice of agricultural engineers of our state college and other institutions.

A local survey substantiates the fact that repairing of old farm buildings and building of new farm structures is a decided financial problem; the lack of most economical and practical building methods and plans is also a problem. It is recommended that the state college do more research work to discover the most economical methods of repairing and rebuilding on the farm.

FARM CREDIT

The problem of how good farm boys and girls can be soundly established in the business of farming (rather than having them migrate to other fields) has been noted by the committee. Federal agencies such as the Farm Credit Administration; through the Farm Loan Association; and the Production Credit Association and the Farm Security Administration, through the rural rehabilitation and tenant purchase programs, have helped materially in this problem. The committee feels that these and other agencies making credit available to farm folks should make available, particularly to the youth groups, the conditions under which they make loans and the methods that are used in paying them off. The committee recommends the continuance of the aid given by some agencies in the matter of farm management and suggest that, where possible, others work out such a program. Farm management should be a part of the program of all agricultural educational agencies;
for if sound management practices are followed, prompt payments of loans can be made.

The extent of loans granted by some of the federal agencies is shown in Figure 24.

Figure 24 - Summary Sheet of Farm Credit Agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Production Credit</th>
<th>Farm Security</th>
<th>Land Bank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of Loans</td>
<td>Amt. of Loans</td>
<td>No. of Loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$ 8,585</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6,512</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,394</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanchard</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13,528</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darlington</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21,754</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Grove</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8,350</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12,016</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gratiot</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4,468</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendall</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20,553</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonont</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,245</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monticello</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,949</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Diggins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,073</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seymour</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19,757</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shullsburg</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12,392</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Oak Springs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,490</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow Springs</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21,912</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiota</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10,425</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 194 $171,500 98 $119,463 260

1/ Added to this number of 98 F.S.A. loans are thirteen tenant purchase farms in the county, with a total value of $127,245.00.

2/ As of December 31, 1939, the Land Bank had 272 loans in Lafayette county totaling $2,007,000.00. This represents about 12% of all the real estate loans in Lafayette county, according to a report from their office.

The land use committee recommends that the Farm Security Administration continue: (1) to make special effort to assist farmers in the purchase of lime and fertilizer to standard rehabilitation loans; (2) to continue aiding farmers in the purchase of machinery, livestock and tractors and necessary home equipment on the farms where the farm and home plan will show the advisability of these purchases. It is of interest to note that of the Farm Security borrowers, two-thirds of the group are less than forty years of age. The Farm Security office files show that twenty-four percent of their borrowers are in the twenties; forty-three percent are in the thirties; sixteen percent are in the forties; ten percent are in the fifties; and seven percent are between the ages of sixty and seventy-six. The average farm comprises 161 acres, including 87 acres of crop land.
The land use committee recommends that all credit agencies continue to offer credit to farmers in this area; that they refuse loans to farmers who are living on land not classified as good agricultural land; and that farm credit supervisors apply the land use classification map with suggested farm practices as suggested by local committees living in the definite land use areas. Leases of more than a one-year term should be encouraged. Community group service financed by farm credit sources is urged; also this same source of credit should be more available for medical care. This committee requests the continued cooperation of the P.C.A. and F.S.A. in helping our vocational agriculture students in financing their projects, which will, in many cases, aid these young men in becoming established in farming.

There may be need for some debt adjustment in all credit agencies as there are many high per acre loans in Lafayette county. The committee recommends that very serious encouragement be given by farm groups to the members in Congress, in order that the present rate of interest on Federal Land Bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans may be made permanent. This would assist in bringing about a lower rate of interest by all lenders. Also, it is suggested that the credit agencies cooperate with the land use planning committee in carrying out these recommendations.

FARM LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

The land use committee expressed considerable concern over the farm labor situation and its correlation with public welfare organization. Figure 25 shows, by years, the number working on W.P.A. and those waiting for certification. The figure also indicates the number of cases receiving surplus commodities and the number receiving direct relief.

Figure 25 - Public Welfare Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jan. 1939</th>
<th>Jan. 1940</th>
<th>Jan. 1941</th>
<th>April 1941</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.P.A. working</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.P.A. waiting</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. receiving surplus commodities</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>*48</td>
<td>*18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. receiving direct relief</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On January 1, 1941, there were 48 cases receiving clothing in the county and 18 cases receiving clothing on April 1, 1941. Beginning in October, 1940, the food stamp plan was
put into operation, replacing the direct delivery of food commodities to the homes of needy families. The total cases involved in the stamp plan was 212 on January 1, 1941, and 237 cases on March 1, 1941. These total cases include those classed under social security, W.P.A. and direct relief. All townships have a relatively equal distribution of relief cases, with the exception of Benton and New Diggings townships which have a larger number of cases than any other township, due to the fact that the mines are not being operated.

An educational program is presented by the public welfare office in connection with the food stamp plan for the purpose of stimulating food stamp purchases and moving the surplus foods off the market. This program might also include discussions of surplus foods for school lunch projects, for the farmers producing the foods, for the merchants selling the produce and for the families eligible to participate in the food stamp program. Everyone interested would be invited to attend such meetings.

Farmers have complained that because of the W.P.A. program, they are unable to hire men for farm labor. In this connection, a complaint is often made by individuals seeking employment at the public welfare department that farmers do not pay regular wages and a man with a family is unable to meet his household expenses unless he can depend on regular wages. There is another complaint that a man with a family cannot live on an occasional day's farm work; he must know that he will be employed for a definite period of time in order that his wages will meet his budget. The matter of housing the family of the worker on the farm is another problem.

Closer cooperation between the local Farm Security Administration and the public welfare department is suggested. In view of the fact that many potential farmers are now unemployed, a basis for cooperative farm planning for relief families might be established. Garden planning for public assistance families is suggested, including seed supplies and supervision of canning and caring for food reserves. No aid should be granted if local town officials indicate no effort has been made in such a project by the client.

Cases have been reported in which people on W.P.A. have been offered full time work but refused to accept jobs offered because of fewer hours with probably equal wages on W.P.A. It is recommended that local town or village officers appoint someone to act as consultant, who is to forward information to the public welfare department relative to the eligibility of applicants for W.P.A. certification. Local people should accept local jobs when offered. The "line" waiting for certification may be long. Unmarried people may be in this line, maybe those who are less deserving than those who have dependents. Local officials would know local conditions and could give valuable aid to the public welfare department on these matters.
The committee recommends that the public welfare office send forms to each town chairman and village clerk to be filled in by him for an applicant prior to certification, to assist the welfare supervisor in proper classification of the client.

The committee believes there is a need for a closer cooperation between the farmers needing farm help and the public welfare department where men are registered as available for employment. If a man is qualified for farm work, it would be of advantage to the department in helping him to find that type of work if farmers needing men would register with that office. The department, serving as a contact agency, could also assist the farmer in locating needed help.

Because of the seriousness of obtaining farm labor, the committees in one section of the county believed the selective service program has been a definite factor. It was the recommendation that the draft board should be drawn from distributed communities in order that all areas of the county are equally represented on this local board. It was suggested at the county committee meeting that members of the selective service draft board serve for a five-month period, and that one new member replace a former member at the end of each five-month period. It was further suggested that these members be selected from representative parts of the county in so far as possible; and that each member of the county board of supervisors nominate one man from the area he represents and the members of the draft board be selected from this list. The above suggestion received the unanimous approval of the entire committee.

FARM WOODLOT CONSERVATION

Practically the entire area of woodlands of Lafayette county is of the oak-hickory type. There is little timber that averages over twelve inches in diameter.

Assessors' reports show that 44.4% of the farm land of Lafayette county is in pasture land. Of this pasture land, 13.2% is wooded, or 5.8% of the total farm land. In 1939, there were 923 farms reporting woodland (1940 census) and a total of 17,681 acres. (There is a direct relationship between soil conservation and woodlot conservation in the opinion of the committee.)

Of the 923 farms in Lafayette county which have woodlots, though detached from the main farm, many have been used primarily as a source of fuelwood, fenceposts and construction materials and have contributed considerable savings to the owners. Some of these woodlands have been depleted by grazing and by over-cutting. It is recommended that woodlands in these areas originally set aside for timber production be maintained as forest lands through protection from grazing by using more
desirable lands for pasture and pasture improvement. Selective cutting practices should then be used and new plantings made so that a constant supply of wood could be maintained.

One of the biggest woodland problems in Lafayette county is "How to keep cows off steep slopes and out of the woods". It is recommended that steep lands grow a crop of trees and that all woodlands be kept unpastured to permit growth and reproduction and assure continuous tree crops. To offset pasture loss from lands kept ungrazed, pasture improvement of old blue-grass or removing timber from the slight slopes to make better pasture from part of the woodland is recommended.

It is recommended that farmers having unpastured woodlands take advantage of the provisions in the Wisconsin woodlot tax exemption law.

Woods fires and destructive cutting practices have caused much damage and poor quality timber in the woodlands of this county. It is recommended that farmers protect woodlots from fire and follow better cutting practices. Recommended cuttings that remove mature trees should be combined with improvement cuttings which remove over-mature, dead, deformed and diseased trees along with others that crowd or overtop thrifty young saplings or interfere with the growth of "final crop" trees.

Falling water tables, wind and water erosion and severe drought have resulted mainly from this break down of a natural balance between forest and prairie. Planting trees on all available waste land with windbreaks around farm homes as well as some roadside planting will prevent excessive water runoff and evaporation, wind and water erosion and will serve as snow fences and give food and protection to wild life.

Woodlot management, windbreak and shelterbelt planting demonstrations have been conducted in parts of the county through the extension office and the college of agriculture. It is recommended that these educational demonstrations continue, when requested, in areas where requests are made and the need is justifiable.

Stream banks could be better protected if trees were planted there. This would aid in maintaining game as well as forest preserves. Low land areas not conveniently drained should be left as a game refuge. It is the belief of the committee that schools might cooperate more in tree planting on the school grounds and on adjacent land. Such projects could be easily adopted by Arbor Day programs. The Ranger Mac radio program of the college of agriculture is to be locally encouraged with more schools listening in.
Due to much needed woodlot and wild game conservation, the land use committee suggests that schools teach more conservation, that an Arbor Day program be formulated in each district which would result in beautifying the school grounds and encouraging students to participate in conservation projects.

All rural schools, where an electric line hookup is available, should be electrified. The committee believes the state superintendent of schools should urge school districts: (1) to improve their lighting; (2) to have their pupils partake in radio programs; and (3) to provide hot lunches.

It is hoped that the fine cooperation between the teachers of vocational agriculture, farm agency leaders, and the agricultural agent will be continued. We understand that each year, the Agricultural Committee of the county board outlines the program of work for the county agricultural agent. The committee suggests that agriculture teachers, with representatives of agricultural agencies of the county, meet regularly with the agent at a date agreed upon to discuss the county agent’s and other farm agencies’ programs as outlined and to acquire a better understanding of these various agencies. All agricultural programs should closely coincide; they should strive, in general, for the same goals.

Our youth should be encouraged to participate in fair exhibits, and they are especially encouraged to make larger exhibits at the Wisconsin junior state fair.

The New Diggings school district consists of only six sections. Taxes are to the limit. It is recommended that the Race Track school district be added to New Diggings, making a twelve section district. The Race Track, with its present low enrollment, would then be closed. This recommendation is made to the New Diggings town board.

BEAUTIFICATION OF GROUNDS

The rural school beautification project has been carried out in the Darlington and Belmont areas, including twenty-five participating schools. There are thirteen schools in the Wayne area planning a like program.

Grounds about some homes, schools, churches and factories are
untidy. It is recommended that more stress be placed on the
above ground beautification by farm agencies.

Small rural cemeteries, in some cases, have been neglected.
It is recommended that communities surrounding such cemeteries
give attention to this ground and beautify them to a moderate
extent.

Our state is often referred to as vacation land, and
tourist trade is outstanding. On our wide permanently located
highways, it is recommended that more stress be put on the
planting of trees within the limits of the highway property.
Where practical, W.P.A. labor should be considered a source of
labor for this project.

HEALTH

Garden projects are now carried
by over fifty 4-H boys and girls of
the county. Hot lunches have been
available in about 75% of the rural
schools. These are factors for better
health. Regardless, the committee
realizes that dental and physical de-
fects are often caused from lack of
proper food. This does not mean that
the children do not have food, but, rather, that
they do not use the food that is available to
them in this county - such as dairy and garden products. Be-
cause of these facts, we suggest that an intensive educational
program be carried on in the school by the county nurse, with
the help of the teachers and interested groups in Lafayette
county, to show need for using the dairy products that are so
necessary to health. There should be encouragement in the use
of garden space to raise as many vegetables as possible for
family consumption. Hot lunches in the schools may help to
educate the child in planning healthful meals and show a defi-
nite improvement in the health of a child.

The committee recommends that the land use chairman, with
the county agent, the supervisor of the public welfare depart-
ment, and the county nurse, name a sub-committee to act under
the land use committee to study the possibility and practica-
bility of the grub stake plan now used in some other counties
of the state.

There are a number of children who need care by a physician
or dentist, but whose parents cannot always obtain the medical
attention needed due to lack of finances. We suggest the co-
operation of all agencies concerned to assist in educating
parents to concentrate on the healthful training of the pre-
school child in the prevention of defects. A child upon enter-
ing school should ideally have proper eating habits, cleanliness,
immunization and vaccination. This can be accomplished with a
minimum of expense if all these preventive measures are taken
before school age. In the purchase of glasses and tonsillec-
tomies, contact lay groups, such as women's clubs, P.T.A.'s,
Since corn acreages under the A.A.A. are not adequate to supply both silage and grain requirements on Lafayette county farms, it is recommended that consideration be given those farms using corn for silage. Additional allotments should be granted providing a cover crop is seeded that same fall after the corn has been removed for silage. This crop should be classified as general depleting and it should be granted on a percentage basis with a maximum limit of five acres. This additional acreage must be used for silage.

Lafayette county farmers receive about 40% of their income from dairying. We recommend that dairy products be declared as a basic commodity and a national program be devised for dairy products.

In this area, it is more practical to use commercial fertilizer on a seeded hay crop with the nurse crop harvested for grain in place of hay. The committee recommends a change whereby credit be given toward soil building payments where fertilizer (phosphate and potash) is applied to a grain crop when such crop is used as a nurse crop for new seeding.

At present, for a county to be in the commercial corn area, it is necessary to have an average farm production of 450 bushels of corn and an average yield of 4 bushels per acre of farm land. Recommendations are that any county having an average of 3 bushels per acre of farm land be placed in the commercial corn area.

This committee recommends that pork, eggs and other farm products not under the A.A.A. program be placed in the A.A.A. program to assist market stabilization.

Since Lafayette county is subject to considerable soil erosion, substantiated by state and local surveys, it is recommended that farms in the A.A.A. program be given more credit for soil conserving practices such as tree planting, strip cropping, buffer strips, earth fill dams and the like.

This committee encourages the continuation of the equalization of corn allotments, compared with four other farms.

Our recommendation is that a program similar to that of 1939 be adopted whereby corn sealing is under agreement for a
one year loaning privilege in place of the present two-year period agreement.

Whereas the main objectives of the A.A.A. are the reduction of surplus farm production, the finding of new uses for these surpluses and the conservation of soil resources, this committee recommends that farmers who are using horses and mules to the extent of at least one adult animal for each 25 acres of cropland be allowed a two-acre increase in their present allotments of soil deflected crops per horse or mule kept on their farms; and that two animals under two years of age be considered equivalent to one adult.

It is recommended that the agricultural conservation and parity payments be increased in order that farmers receive their fair share of the national defense funds; also an increase in the soil-building allowance for pasture renovation, an increase in the soil-building allowance for the use of red clover and potash (this is now lower than phosphate). Keep the administration of the programs in the hands of the dirt farmers, with a closer tie-up between all federal agencies.

Extend the conservation materials program to include legume and grass seed and sodium chloride to be used in the control of Canada thistle and creeping jenny; grant county and community committees more leeway in the establishment of allotments for individual farms; increase the loan value of corn if quotas are voted in; make available more educational moving pictures (sound) for use in the committee and farmers' meetings; farmer committees be appointed to control farm imports; the land use committee approves the principles of the A.A.A. program and recommends its continuance.

GENERAL

This committee recognizes the seriousness of the tax problem. They recommend further study of taxation, with the county agent arranging meetings with land use groups for drawing up possible solutions, particularly as it affects improvements and real estate property in urban areas.

It is believed that legislation is most effective where proposed legislation is backed by organization. To receive better results in our legislatures, it is recommended that all farmers should be urged to belong to at least one national farm organization.

This committee is opposed to the diversion of highway funds; because if such funds are entirely used for highway purposes, there would be no necessity of local unit real estate taxation for that source of revenue.
Our farm women in Lafayette county do not have leadership for educational homemaker programs. It is recommended that home economics teachers and F.S.A. home supervisors within their districts and state extension workers be made available for demonstrations, especially in regard to the use of the "pressure cooker".

Where vacancies occur in industry, farming, and educational fields, it is recommended that preference be given to youth rather than to married women whose husbands are employed.

Because all but one manufacturer do not make their discs so that they can be pulled out of the soil when crossing a ditch, we recommend this change be adopted by all farm machine companies.

As farm income from swine projects is of major concern, we recommend all agricultural agencies concerned place particular emphasis on economical swine production.

A suggestion is that the county land use planning committee meet early to discuss major agricultural problems of the county; the Agricultural Committee may use their suggestions in drawing up the annual agricultural extension program.
SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS MADE BY
THE LAFAYETTE COUNTY LAND USE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Land Use Areas and Soil Erosion Control

The county land use planning committee recommends that:

(1) The 1,472 acres of class C land which is questionably suited for farming should be converted to woodlot and protected from fire and grazing. Parts of farms in this area should be retired from cultivation and seeded to permanent pasture. If any of this area is to be cropped, better soil building practices should be used with only most suitable crops planted.

(2) As 18.2% of the county's land is subject to little or no erosion, recommendations are based, first, on flat land other than river bottoms. Suggestions are for a short rotation of corn, grain and hay, or two years of corn. Alfalfa is occasionally advisable, and timothy may be added to hay mixtures. Large areas with very slight but long slopes may be benefited by strip cropping. Sod crops should be kept in a longer rotation in unproductive soils, and green manuring is a good practice.

On flat river bottom land, short rotations with corn as a major crop is desirable if the area is not frequented by floods. Bluegrass pasture is best in flooded areas. On such areas, alfalfa may be difficult to harvest and poor drainage is probable. Seeding may be done to choke weeds; narrow or irregular strips should be left as pasture. Barley may be seeded in a rotation with red clover, alsike, redtop or timothy. Reed's canary grass is suggested for trial if portions of the area are flooded a part of the year.

(3) Because about 81.3% of the land is subject to soil erosion, there is need of a change in cropping practices if controlling practices have not already been put into effect. On gentle slopes of 2-8%, recommendations are for a medium rotation with corn, grain seeded, and hay. Generally, field strips are recommended. Contour strips are preferred with cultivated crops where soil washing is more serious. In smaller fields where slopes are irregular, buffer strips are suggested. With a short rotation on a gentle slope, terracing may be done; terracing should be done only upon the advice of experienced assistance.

Medium slopes require the above outlined practices with hay crops making up a higher percent total cropland. Contour strips are recommended.

Steep slopes now in cultivation are generally recommended to be seeded into permanent hay or pasture, with plowing only for this crop or for soil treatment. Rye is suggested for broadcast prior to last cultivation. Plowing on a contour is recommended; if these areas must be cropped, gentle slope recommendations are suggested.
For slopes of over 30-35%, light soil of low fertility, waste land or badly eroded areas, tree planting is suggested with recommendations included in farm woodlot conservation.

(4) In connection with general erosion control problems, fences may be rearranged so as to be on a contour, and pasture renovation is recommended in pasture areas. Where gullies have started, consideration should be given to proper land use in the gully drainage area. Sod hump dams and sod flumes are recommended; a plank or earth diversion dike may be used; brush and rock wing dams or willow plantings may be successful on stream bank cuttings; grass waterways of at least ten foot width, with uneven edges, are effective.

Teachers of vocational agriculture are recommended to stress the above outlined practices in their supervised practice program. Extension service is recommended to assist agriculture teachers, upon request, in laying strips on student farms.

Prior to culvert installation on a highway, where washing may result on low fields, the recommendation is that all parties concerned meet to discuss best methods of procedure.

We recommend to the county board of supervisors that Lafayette county be established as a soil conservation district through passage of a resolution by that body. (Note - Resolution was passed on May 7th at the county board session.)

Farm Tenancy

(1) Because the county ranks first in farm tenancy in Wisconsin the erosion control practices, soil fertility maintenance and farm credit problems become outstanding. Recommendations are that landlord and tenants, as well as all farm agencies, make more use of flexible lease forms. The committee recommends that the extension office contact the Department of Agricultural Economics, College of Agriculture, to secure assistance in conducting needed research on this tenancy problem. Further, recommendations are that the county land use committee chairman, with the county agent, name a sub-committee to assist in the organization and procedure for this research project. (Note - A survey is being made at present in one township used as a county sample. The survey is being conducted under the direction of the land use chairman, the county agent, a sub-committee, and the Department of Agricultural Economics.)

Dairy Improvement

(1) Because 38.4% of the county's farm income is derived from milk, quality milk would increase the profits from milk by farmers and factory operators. The committee recommends the quality milk program. (Note - The quality milk program was voted in by farmers and factory operators in April, 1941.)

(2) In order that more herdsmen may more efficiently and economically cull their herds and thereby raise butterfat averages, this committee recommends the owner-sampler method of milk testing be
introduced into the county. W.P.A. and N.Y.A. labor is requested for testing where possible and practical.

(3) Since disastrous experiences have resulted from so-called stock yard bulls, the recommendation is to the Wisconsin Legislature that laws be enacted to require a license for those who peddle such bulls. The law relative to Bang's test for transfer of animals (over six months of age) should be strictly enforced.

Soil Fertility

(1) Because soil tests show that about 74% of the tested samples require two tons or more of lime, 91% require phosphate and 64% require potash, the committee recommends the continuation of the W.P.A. soil testing and soil survey projects. The fertilizer test trial plot program should be continued to demonstrate the effectiveness of fertilizer.

(2) The continuation of the W.P.A. lime grinding program is recommended.

Weeds

(1) Since weed eradication is becoming a major problem, especially so with creeping Jenny and Canada thistle, the committee recommends to the county board of supervisors that they consider an appropriation for sodium chlorate for chemical weed control; and it is suggested that farmers pay 50 or 60% of the cost for the chemical when purchase is made. A county-wide program should be considered with W.P.A., N.Y.A. and C.C.C. labor used when possible for chemical application.

(2) W.P.A. labor is suggested for roadside weed destruction; the town should finance a sprayer or spreader where such is used to destroy weeds on public property.

(3) The committee recommends township consideration of a weed control program whereby the town is divided into two or more districts; stamped cards could be sent to each farmer, with the weed law stated; the returned card which could be sent to the district weed commissioner could indicate whether or not noxious weeds are destroyed. The district commissioner would carry out duties as stated in the weed law.

(4) Alfalfa is recommended as a weed smother crop, particularly good for control of Canada thistle in cropland.

Farm Buildings

(1) Farm buildings comprise the major investment on many farms. Buildings are depreciating, in many cases, faster than repairs are made, due primarily to a lack of financing. The solution for this problem varies according to the size of the
farm, local markets, crops raised, the possibility of combining farms under one homestead, or the changing of crops or livestock enterprises. The committee's recommendation for the present is for farm owners and operators, prior to repair or rebuilding, to first use judgment on all factors, combined with the advice of agricultural engineers of our state college and other institutions.

(2) It is recommended that the state college do more research to discover the most economical methods of repairing and rebuilding on the farm.

**Farm Credit**

(1) Because it is difficult for youth to become established in farming and because financial help and farm management guidance is a farm credit agency contribution, the committee recommends all farm loan agencies to more generously advertise their programs in order that young people will acquaint themselves with these organizations.

(2) The Farm Security Administration should continue: (1) to make special effort to assist farmers in purchase of lime and fertilizer to standard rehabilitation loans; and, (2) to continue aiding farmers in the purchase of livestock, tractors, other farm machinery and necessary home equipment.

(3) All credit agencies continue to offer credit to farmers in this area. (Pages 40 and 41.)

(4) Encouragement be given by farm groups to members of Congress in order that present rate of interest on Federal Land Bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans may be made permanent.

(5) Credit agencies cooperate with the land use planning committee in carrying out these recommendations.

**Farm Labor and Public Welfare**

(1) Because there are some people who do not understand the relationship of the public welfare department to the farm labor problem, all people should be invited to attend educational meetings pertaining to the food stamp program. Garden planning for the public assistance family is suggested.

(2) Closer cooperation between the local Farm Security Administration and the public welfare department is suggested.

(3) No public aid should be granted if local town officials indicate no effort has been made in a garden or canning project by the client.

(4) There is a need for a closer cooperation between the public welfare office in the county and farmers needing farm help.
(5) Local town or village officers may appoint someone to act as consultant, who is to forward information to the public welfare department relative to the eligibility of applicants for W.P.A. certification. Local officials may be better qualified to know these conditions.

(6) The public welfare office may send forms to each town chairman and village clerk to be filled in by him for an applicant prior to certification, to assist the public welfare supervisor in proper classification of the client.

(7) Because of the seriousness of obtaining farm labor, the committees in one section of the county believed the selective service program has been a definite factor. It was the recommendation that the draft board should be drawn from distributed communities in order that all areas of the county are equally represented on this local board. It was suggested at the county committee meeting that members of the selective service draft board serve for a five-month period, and that one new member replace a former member at the end of each five-month period. It was further suggested that these members be selected from representative parts of the county in so far as possible; and that each member of the county board of supervisors nominate one man from the area he represents and the members of the draft board be selected from this list. The above suggestion received the unanimous approval of the entire committee.

Fur Woodlot Conservation

(1) Because farm woodlots contribute considerable savings to owners in fuel, fence wood and construction material, and as woodlands have been depleted by grazing and over-cutting, it is recommended that these areas be maintained as forest areas through woodlot management, selective cutting practices, and new plantings.

(2) Steep lands should grow a crop of trees and all such slopes should be protected from grazing to encourage tree reproduction.

(3) Farmers having unpastured woodlands should take advantage of the provisions in the Wisconsin woodlot tax exemption law.

(4) Farmers should protect woodlots from fire and follow better selective cutting practices.

(5) Windbreak and shelterbelt planting demonstrations are to be conducted where requested, and farmers plant trees as windbreaks and shelterbelts in areas where justifiable.

(6) Trees should be planted along stream banks and low land areas; if not conveniently drained, should be left as game reserves.
(7) Schools may cooperate in more tree planting projects.

(8) The Ranger Mac radio program of State Radio Station WHA is an effective educational program on conservation. More schools are encouraged to listen in.

Schools and Agricultural Agencies

(1) Because of much needed woodlot and wild game conservation, schools should teach more conservation and an Arbor Day program should be formulated in each district.

(2) The state superintendent of schools should encourage all school districts to electrify their school buildings.

(3) Agriculture teachers, with agricultural agencies of the county, should meet regularly with the agent at a date agreed upon to discuss agricultural problems of the county. Agricultural problems should closely coincide, and they should strive for the same general goals.

(4) More youth should be encouraged to exhibit at county and state fairs.

Beautification of Grounds

(1) More stress might be placed on factory, church, school and home yard beautification by the various agricultural agencies.

(2) Communities surrounding rural cemeteries should give attention to beautifying these lots.

(3) More trees may be planted within the limits of the permanent highway property, and W.P.A. labor should be considered a source of labor for this project.

Health

(1) Because of dental and physical defects of youth, caused from lack of proper food, an intensive educational program should be carried on in the school by the county nurse, with teacher cooperation, to show need for using dairy products and home produced vegetables. School hot lunches are encouraged.

(2) The grub stake plan should receive study by the land use chairman, county agent, county nurse, public welfare supervisor and their sub-committee, to determine the practicability of such a program in this county.

(3) The cooperation of all agencies concerned is suggested to assist in an educational program relative to the necessity of pre-school child health problems. Credit agencies may be of assistance where the need arises.
Agricultural Conservation Program

(1) Because of inadequate corn acreages provided in the Agricultural Conservation Program, consideration should be given those farms using corn for silage; allotments should be granted providing a cover crop is seeded that same fall after the corn has been removed for silage. This crop should be classified as general depleting and granted on a percentage basis, with a maximum limit of five acres. The crop must be used for silage.

(2) Dairy products should be declared as a basic commodity and a national program should be devised for dairy products.

(3) Credit should be given toward soil building payments where phosphate and potash fertilizer are applied to a grain crop when such crop is used as a nurse crop for hay.

(4) Any county having an average yield of three bushels per acre of farm land should be placed in the commercial corn area.

(5) Pork, eggs and other farm products not under the A.A.A. program should be placed there to assist market stabilization.

(6) Farms in the A.A.A. program should be given more credit for soil conserving practices such as tree planting, strip cropping, buffer strips, earth fill dams and the like.

(7) Encouragement is given to the continuation of the equalization of corn allotments compared with four other farms.

(8) Corn sealing should be under a one-year agreement loaning privilege.

(9) Farmers who use horses and mules to the extent of at least one adult animal for each twenty-five acres of cropland should be allowed a two-acre increase in their present allotments of soil depleting crops per horse or mule kept on their farms, and two animals under two years of age should be considered equivalent to one adult.

(10) It is recommended that the agricultural conservation and parity payments be increased in order that farmers receive their fair share of the national defense funds; and, (1) increase the soil building allowance for pasture renovation; (2) increase the soil building allowance for the use of red clover; and, (3) increase the soil building allowance for the use of potash (this is now lower than phosphate); include in the conservation materials program (1) legume and grass seed; and (2) sodium chlorate to be used in the control of Canada thistle and creeping jenny. Grant county and community committees more leeway in the establishment of allotments for individual farms; increase the loan value of corn if quotas are voted in; make
available more educational moving pictures (sound) for use in
the committee and farmers' meetings; farmer committees be
appointed to control farm imports. The administration of the
program should be kept in the hands of the dirt farmers, with
a closer tie-up between all federal agencies.

The land use committee approves the principles of
the A.A.A. program and recommends its continuance.

General

(1) Because of the apparent tax problem, the future
study of taxation should be made, with the county agent arrang-
ing meetings with land use groups for drawing up possible
solutions, particularly as it affects improvements and real
estate property in urban areas.

(2) It is believed that legislation is the most effective
where proposed legislation is backed by organization. All
farmers should be urged to belong to at least one national farm
organization.

(3) Opposition is given to the diversion of highway
funds.

(4) Home economics teachers and the F.S.A. supervisor
within their districts and state extension workers should be
made more available for demonstrations.

(5) Where vacancies occur, preference should be given
to youth rather than married women whose husbands are employed.

(6) All farm machinery manufacturers should make their
discs so that they may be pulled out of the soil when crossing
a ditch.

(7) All agricultural agencies should place particular
emphasis on economical swine production.

(8) The county land use planning committee should meet
eyarly to discuss major agricultural problems of the county;
the Agricultural Committee may use their suggestions in drawing
up the annual agricultural extension program.

* * * * *